DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 709 UD 001 787

School Racial Policy.
American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 66
Note-42p.
Available from-American Association of School Administrators, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. ($2.00).
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-Board of Education Policy, Bus Transportation, Compensatory Education Programs, Curriculum, Development, Educational Complexes, Educational Finance, Equal Education, Grade Organization, Guidelines, *Integration Methods, Open Enrollment, Personnel Policy, Public Schools, Racial Balance, School Community Relationship, School Districts, *School Integration, School Organization, *School Responsibility, Zoning

A group of school administrators was appointed in 1963 to develop principles and guidelines for effective achievement of school integration. This document focuses on identifying problems of school desegregation, noting the methods being used, and indicating the necessary preconditions within public education for meeting the challenge. Contained are chapters on problems of organization and support for education, various integration methods and compensatory programs, and the steps that every school district can undertake. It is noted that a national commitment to equal opportunity must involve all the other governmental bodies and civic and welfare organizations in addition to school systems. (NH)

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

01787

School Racial Policy

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ED023709

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AD 001 787

PUBLISHED BY *American Association of School Administrators*, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

3

Copyright 1966
American Association of School
Administrators

All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Single copy, $2.00. Quantity orders: 2-9 copies, 10 percent discount; 10 or more copies, 20 percent discount.

Postage charged on billed orders.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

The AASA Special Commission
on
School Racial Policy

Samuel Miller Brownell
Superintendent of Schools
Detroit, Michigan

William L. Cobb
Human Relations Officer
San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco, California

James A. Hazlett
Superintendent of Schools
Kansas City, Missouri

Howard L. Johnson
Assistant Superintendent for
Personnel Services
Denver Public Schools
Denver, Colorado

Howard C. Seymour
Superintendent of Schools
Phoenix Union High Schools and
Phoenix College System
Phoenix, Arizona

Mark R. Shedd
Superintendent of Schools
Englewood, New Jersey

E. C. Stimbert
Superintendent of Schools
Memphis, Tennessee

Lester F. Zerfoss
Director of Management Services
American Enka Corporation
Enka, North Carolina

Chairman

Carroll F. Johnson
Superintendent of Schools
White Plains, New York

Secretary

Archibald B. Shaw
Chairman, Department of Administration
and Higher Education
College of Education,
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

PREFACE

In August of 1963 President Natt B. Burbank and the Executive Committee of AASA appointed a commission to "try to think through one of the most serious and difficult problems of our times, namely the ways and means by which integration in the schools can be most effectively achieved." The Executive Committee hoped that this commission might "arrive at some fundamental principles which might be identified as guides for superintendents in all sections of the nation." The difficulty and "possible impossibility of the task" were acknowledged in the letter of appointment.

Archibald B. Shaw (until recently associate executive secretary of AASA and now chairman of the Department of Administration and Higher Education at Michigan State University) served as secretary to the commission. He organized meetings, stimulated commission members, and organized and edited the report.

During 1965 the Educational Policies Commission issued *American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity.* We commend this excellent document to all who are concerned with the field of equal education and equal rights. We regard our own publication, *School Racial Policy,* as complementary to the Educational Policies Commission's study. We hope that our statement will provide guidelines for those communities in which race and color are problems of major educational significance.

CARROLL F. JOHNSON, Chairman
AASA Special Commission on School Racial Policy

Table of Contents

Preface 5

Introduction 9

Chapter I Public Schools and Desegregation **11**

Chapter II Problems of Organization and Support for Education **15**

Chapter III Some Current Experience in School Integration **21**

- Bus Transportation 21
- Open Enrollment 23
- Controlled Balance 24
- Attendance Boundaries 24
- Reorganization of Grades 25
- School Village 25
- Catch-Up Programs 27

Chapter IV Some Things Every School District Can Do **29**

- General Policies of Boards of Education 31
- Personnel Policies and Practices 32
- Organization of the Schools 33
- School-Community Relations 34
- Curriculum and Curriculum Materials 36

Chapter V The Schools Cannot Do It Alone **40**

Chapter VI The Commission Believes **43**

School Racial Policy

Introduction

America has always been a nation in the process of becoming. Almost every generation has received, sometimes not too graciously, its influx of immigrants—newcomers adding their skills, problems, and customs to the culture. Over the years each immigrant group in turn has been assimilated into the society, helping to shape it in the process. Without abandoning all of their old cultural patterns, the minority groups have gradually projected themselves into the mainstreams of American government, economics, and society.

Access to full citizenship was never so easy as we have proclaimed. But for a century and more successive waves of immigrants have battled their way through the slums, through the menial tasks, through the suspicions and prejudices of those who had already arrived and won a place, all the way through to a respected status in nearly every occupation, class, and neighborhood.

Among the barriers faced by minority groups, skin color has been the most nearly invincible. Negroes, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, American Indians, Cubans, and some Asians share one common handicap—skin color which makes their difference visible. Education, service to church and community, abandonment of family and old country customs, Americanization of name—approaches that seemed to work for others have not always opened the door to equal opportunity for these groups.

We are concerned with the conditions of all of our disadvantaged. However, in this study we focus on the

particular problems of the American Negro. For him alone Liberty never promised to lift her lamp beside a golden door. He came to this country under coercion. After he arrived, he was allowed neither to continue the family arrangements of his own culture nor to establish those common in this country. Slave owners did not permit family unity. A natural result was what is now called a lack of intrafamily responsibility. Sociologists cite this problem as one of the Negro's deepest difficulties in adapting to modern American society. Slum living conditions increase the hopelessness of his outlook. Barriers to full citizenship outrage his human dignity. Educational handicaps narrow his economic horizons.

Now, Americans—more and more of them as events unfold—are awakening to the fact that for the American Negro our status arteries are not open, that our "fluid" society has jelled in patterns and forms that shut off the free and equal access to the good life which we have so long held to be the endowment of every American.

Recent years of painful confrontation are bringing us at last much nearer to a national consensus. Clergymen are telling us that God is colorblind. Anthropologists find that skin color is fundamentally unrelated to capacities, physiological and mental. The Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States have decreed that opportunity for productive participation in all of the affairs of American life shall be opened equally to all citizens. Congress has gone further: it has taken the revolutionary position that we must compensate in part for past discriminations with vast sums of money for programs designed to equalize opportunity.

All these stirrings of conscience and gropings toward consensus take place in an era of racial unrest that challenges the very foundations of our nation of laws. The burning question is, How can public education aid and equip the American Negro to attain full status as an American citizen, a citizen who shares in the benefits and responsibilities of a free society?

Chapter 1

Public Schools and Desegregation

The American public schools today are charged with an unprecedented task: not to perpetuate a culture but to transform it. In the earlier era when waves of immigrants threatened to swamp the emerging American culture, the schools were asked "to give unity to a heterogeneous population, to create a sense of belonging, to inculcate democracy and equality," in one historian's words. However, now the nation has defined new goals for the schools: the end of segregation, the opening of doors to all Americans, and the making real at last of the long and widely held American dream of equality of opportunity for every citizen.

For the schools, the issue of goals is scarcely an issue now. It is how they will reach their goals that troubles them. Thousands of local school districts must work out their individual solutions to school integration problems. They can share promising practices. However, each district's own mixture of problems, community experience, and resources will influence the pattern within which it works toward the national goal.

Everything in experience tells us that there is no royal road to a solution, no single formula for action that will work in an Eastern metropolis, a Midwestern city,

a Southern county seat, and a select suburbia. Yet the problem is nationwide. It affects all American school districts, no matter what their size and character, as it does all American children and citizens. The nonsegregated society to which we aspire must be a society to which all Americans share commitments and in which all hold some values in common.

A state can enact laws ending racial imbalance in its schools when the neighborhood schools that are predominantly nonwhite are relatively few in number. But this doesn't provide a balance in towns and villages with no Negroes. Nor is such a solution open to Manhattan, nor to the District of Columbia, nor to districts anywhere that have either a heavy preponderance or a complete or near-complete absence of nonwhite children. The illustration is given here to point out the unique state, community, and school district characteristics that demand programs peculiar in detail to each area.

Public schools are operated by school districts, and school districts are geographically bounded subdivisions of the state. A district's boundaries may be the same as those of a city, a town, or some other political subdivision: this is frequently true for the large cities. It has only such powers and duties and such leeway for local decisions as are delegated to it by the state. The states themselves have the powers and duties assigned to them by their citizens, as expressed through their state constitutions, subject to the provisions of the United States Constitution.

Every state constitution has embodied in it some statement of commitment to free public education, and every state has established some system for making free education available to its citizens in every section. The exact provisions vary greatly among the states, but with the minor exceptions of a few state-operated schools, the actual operation of public schools has been delegated to local school districts under local public commissions or committees, generally called school boards.

Because education is not specifically mentioned in the federal Constitution, it is reserved as a responsibility of the state. However, the federal government was constituted "to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty." In recent years, this responsibility has been interpreted through court decisions, Congressional enactments, and administrative actions to extend nonsegregated education to *all* citizens.

In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court concluded that "in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place." A year later, it declared "the fundamental principle that racial discrimination in public education is unconstitutional" and that "all provisions of federal, state, or local law requiring or permitting such discrimination must yield to this principle." This and subsequent rulings laid a mandate on all states and school districts. More than a decade later, whatever the delays in desegregation, a legally segregated school system is no longer possible. The school attendance area gerrymandered to achieve segregation within a school district has been declared equally unlawful.

Vast as the social, educational, and organizational problems are that attend the end of legal segregation, they are matched by those that have arisen in nominally nonsegregated school districts. There, housing patterns have too often led to a neighborhood school system made up of all-white, all-Negro, and a few mixed-enrollment schools.

Conscientious school administrators have long been alert to what has been happening to their school systems. They have tried everything possible to them—within the limitations of funds growing relatively more meager, of rapidly changing population, and of housing and socioeconomic trends beyond any schoolman's (or any school board's) power—to influence desegregation of schools. Schools with large Puerto Rican in-migration have sent representatives to Puerto Rico to learn how better to understand and to provide effectively for the Spanish-speaking children. Social workers have been added to help bridge the home-school gap for Negro and rural white in-migrants. Crash reading and language programs have been inaugurated. The superintendents of schools of the larger cities have come together in project after project aimed at reducing the disadvantage of the Negro and other underprivileged youth. They have courageously fought through building programs and have set some of their best school buildings in the heaviest concentrations of the disadvantaged. They have shifted school boundaries to take in white children and have watched in dismay the growth of private schools and the moving away of white families. The devices and plans and provisions have been ingenious and even noble, but the problem persists.

School people have learned that desegregation is a problem with implications for every aspect of the opera-

tion and policy of our schools. Some aspects need attention at the state and multidistrict level. Within districts, it appears that there is no single solution that will apply in all districts or will solve the problem permanently in any one. The schools are learning again that changing fundamental values and attitudes demand continuous reevaluation and experimental solutions in which the whole community must share responsibility.

In the chapters that follow, the Commission has sought to identify some of the problems and call attention to what is being tried and to list some of the conditions that seem necessary if the public schools are to meet this urgent challenge.

Chapter 2

Problems of Organization and Support for Education

The way our public schools are organized for their governance, their support and their relationships, and the preparation of teachers and others who staff them all present important problems that must be met if we are to carry out the new task assigned to the public schools.

The nature and size of local school districts in nearly every state calls for very careful reexamination. Few states have yet gone through the whole process of consolidation and elimination of small and inefficient districts. Few, if any, states have local school districts organized in such a way as to promote the new purposes assigned to the public schools.

New tests are required for the viability of school districts. Some are too big, some are obviously too little, and very many are too one-cultured. Because of the present and probable future distribution of population, school districts that are the right size and kind for previously established purposes may not be so good for ensuring equal opportunity and the growth of understanding among people of many backgrounds. In any plans for the consolidation of small school districts, or for the redistricting of large ones, factors of socioeconomic composition and racial origin should be taken into

account. School districts, like school attendance areas, should be as inclusive as possible.

Interdistrict cooperation, both through intermediate districts, where they are constituted, and through varieties of ad hoc arrangements, is increasingly necessary for a sound educational program. We have evidence, for example, that only through cooperation can many districts carry on the kind of interchange of faculty and students that will promote interracial and intercultural understanding.

In a subsequent chapter, we shall propose detailed policies and practices that will be useful in this connection. Here, however, we stress particularly the necessity for taking into account the effects of interdistrict cooperation on intercultural understanding.

For example, many districts have been cooperating in the support of a regional television station and programs. Such groupings of districts could well be consciously designed to incorporate a wide socioeconomic and racial range in the students to be served and in the programs carried by their stations. The people who participate in the programs could make highly useful contributions to the promotion of understanding.

Similarly, consortiums of districts for special education purposes, for research, and for a whole variety of projects and programs that are too large for most single districts as they are undertaken also should be formed with this added objective in mind.

State departments of education are called on for new strengths, new resources, and new programs if we are to move toward racial desegregation. Everything that state department personnel do, from curriculum leadership through leadership in planning building and facilities, in financing programs, and in district organization—the whole panoply of necessary and desirable state services must be carried on with sensitivity to its implications for this new objective. Such interdistrict cooperation will affect staffing and planning and operational policy and practice and should set the pattern for all districts. Needless to say, state department personnel policies and staffing patterns should set the style for all districts.

In the Commission's view, there is a special need for state departments of education to provide counsel, leadership, and specialized assistance to local districts as they search for and try new ways to provide genuine equality of opportunity.

The United States Office of Education has already made strong strides towards developing the required competence for leadership and counseling. Because mutual respect, equal opportunity, cultural diversity, and constitutional rights are all of primary concern to the American people as a nation, the U.S. Office has a special role to play.

In assigning new roles to the U.S. Office, Congress has regularly charged it to exercise leadership but to eschew control. This is a most difficult role indeed. It calls for studied attention by the upper echelons in the Office to make sure that it permeates every practice and characterizes every dealing at every echelon. The balance between maximum respect for the values of diffusion of decision making and of operational control on the one hand and leadership in implementing the national decisions on the other hand calls for a rare and wonderful competence and dedication for all U.S. Office personnel. Since these qualities are not often or easily exercised continuously by many people, they can be ensured only by the most thoughtful attention to every routine and every aspect of structure through which the U.S. Office discharges its role.

New patterns of fiscal support, justified and desperately needed, are even more strongly required if we are to provide the equal opportunity and the shared experiences to which we are committed. Experience with the distribution of state-raised moneys among the school districts has led to a generally accepted principle that such funds ought to make a basic contribution to the educational program in every school district and hence for every child. Local funds, in part called upon for the basic program, are increasingly freed to provide the extra and locally determined opportunities. It is the Commission's view that federal funds, although in part properly devoted to the support of programs that meet *more* exclusively federal purposes, principally should be devoted to the support of the basic educational program, freeing substantial state and local funds for continuous improvements in the meeting of local and state needs.

Recent experience seems to suggest that local school districts may need some "risk money" beyond the accustomed local funds in order to try out new programs and that these programs may be more easily undertaken when they are not at the expense of the ongoing programs. Similarly, basic and effective research and development programs may well be beyond the financial

reach of local school districts and be of such universal potential as to justify their support from federal funds.

Within and among the states there is little relationship between the gravity and extent of the educational problems and the ability to provide the needed financial support. The distribution of state funds to school districts and federal funds to states must take sharply increased account of these disparities, funneling more money to districts with the special problems.

There is a large and growing consensus that only a combination of funds from local, state, and federal sources will be adequate to provide every child with the kind of educational opportunity that we have declared to be his heritage as an American citizen.

The policies of nonpublic schools are increasingly a proper matter for public concern. The degree to which such schools may offer havens for the economically privileged and socially prejudiced may be threatening the public purpose. Public subsidies through tax exemption or support from public funds make it increasingly important that such schools demonstrate that they are following the same public policies as are required of public schools. It is not clear to the Commission what guarantees if any are for the public good. In every part of the nation the actual or potential policies and practices of such nonpublic schools may perpetuate the very inequalities that as a nation we have set out to eradicate. The Commission notes with pleasure the progress made by the largest nonpublic school system, the Roman Catholic, toward desegregation.

The local school board has a new and broader responsibility. It must now, as never before in its local policies, take proper account of state and national, and indeed world, needs and purposes in its policies for local school problems. It must assume leadership in making local citizens aware of their obligations, of their stake in the affairs of the state and nation, and of the interest their fellow citizens in other parts of the state and nation properly hold in the competency with which every local district meets its challenges. The children within any school district are almost certainly not going to be bound in their concerns, not even in their residences, by the boundaries of that district. Even for the few who may stay, their daily lives and decisions must be informed by far broader considerations than those that are exclusive to the local district.

School board members must maintain a constant flow of information to the people of their district. Local citizens must become involved if they are to realize and

meet their full obligation. Each board has a special obligation to give leadership in informing, in building confidence, and in involving the local citizenry in new relations that will appropriately reflect local, state, and national concerns.

Municipal and school government must enter new and strengthened relationships. It has become increasingly obvious that municipal policies and practices in urban renewal; public housing; maintenance and provision of highways and streets, and other public services; and in a whole host of policies and practices, large and small, have a direct and important effect on the ability of a local school board to carry out its responsibilities. Only by the closest of cooperation and the greatest harmony in objectives can they can hope to build together the human and decent city where equality is real and citizenship worthwhile. There must be a steady flow of information and cooperative problem solving between the city government and the local school government.

In a later chapter, we offer detailed suggestions for arriving at the true consonance which we regard as vital between city and school district government. Here we stress only the necessity for a true consonance in objectives, in policies, in planning, and in program that must characterize the relationship between city government and school district government.

New educational institutions and centers are called for. One of the more exciting provisions of recent federal legislation is that which calls for the establishment of cultural and educational centers. Such centers can serve far more than narrowly defined educational functions. They can provide programs that will bring together people from all socioeconomic groupings, places where children work together, oblivious to color distinctions. As an example, they may be museums, highlighting the contribution of all of the strains that have gone into the establishment of the nation, the state, and the locality. Such centers would provide another opportunity for the school district to involve people of different cultures and to show by facts and example that color and ethnic origin are irrelevant to the competence and dignity of productive people.

The Commission recommends that public school people everywhere explore vigorously the possibilities of such new institutions and centers for the improvement of communication and understanding between people of all religious, racial, and national origins and of every socioeconomic status.

The nature of teacher education in its broadest meaning is drastically affected by these newer objectives. To a degree only hinted at in the days when Americanization of new immigrant groups was one purpose of our city schools, a new kind of education and apprenticeship experience is required for professional school personnel. An understanding of interracial problems is dramatically called for.

The Commission applauds the efforts of institutions to involve their planners and professors directly in the problems of schools in slum settings. It proposes, however, that present efforts are not sufficient. It proposes that every teacher-training institution, program, and plan must be suffused with new insights and new obligations. For the most privileged, exclusive, segregated suburbs; for the most remote, rural consolidated school; and for the deprived areas of our large cities, teachers must be fired with the will and equipped with the skill to promote the attitudes and opportunities that will build a genuine intercultural understanding. The schools must help the teacher-training institution in this task and in turn may well call on the universities for the specialized help these are fitted to give.

The Commission makes no pretense of dealing with all of the large problems that face us in the organization, support, and planning of our great public school system. However, its members do assert that the challenges and problems raised in these areas must be met with more insight, more wisdom, and more wealth than we have so far mustered.

Not all of us can be involved regularly in helping solve these large questions. Every district, however, has an obligation to know of the experience other districts have accumulated with some of the more common proposals.

Chapter 3

Some Current Experience in School Integration

Conscientious school boards and administrators have tried many plans to counter the disadvantages of de facto segregation in urban and suburban school districts. Experience accumulates to support the conclusion that while any plan undertaken with goodwill can help, there is no single policy or procedure or combination of operations that does the job everywhere, or even in a single district over a period of years.

Bus transportation, open enrollment, pupil assignment to secure balanced enrollment, shifting of school attendance boundaries, and reorganization of the grade groupings have all been tried, and a school village concentration has been proposed. Most of these plans have worked somewhere for a time and have helped some children. When introduced they have been useful as symbols of intention and have in practice increased educational opportunity for many.

Bus Transportation

Bus transportation is often proposed to get Negroes to predominantly white schools that have been serving a nearby neighborhood. Without the most careful preparation, the new pupils are set off as strangers if not intruders. Obvious color or culture differences may add to the apartness that is usually felt when the larger

number in a school lives nearby, goes home for lunch, and plays in the neighborhood and calls it home, while another group shows up at school's beginning, stays during the noon hour, and leaves at school's closing. The feeling of separateness persists, even after early antagonisms have been resolved. The experience of consolidated village schools that include nearby children and children bussed in from rural areas confirms this as a common problem.

The age-old instinct to repel the outsider can be countered by a patient and concerned faculty. However, there are endless occasions when bussed children have to be dealt with as a group and their participation in school affairs planned differently. Those who live nearby can come in early or can be kept or come back after school, or their parents can be reached, all on short notice. Not so for children who are bussed. When a school radically changes its accustomed ways of operating, restricting pupil activities to those equally available for all children whether bussed or neighborhood, the children and parents in the neighborhood may resent that change and blame the newcomers. If the school does not change, then it has to deal separately with the two groups, neighborhood and transportee. It takes strenuous and continuing effort to ensure that the bussed children are neither actually nor psychologically set apart from the neighborhood children.

Although there is not much in the literature, there is a great deal in the experience of school people to remind us that the bussing of school-aged children always presents problems to the children, to their families, to the bus operators, and to the schools. It is not casually to be undertaken. It requires thoughtful planning, continuous supervision, and standby provisions for the child who is sometimes left behind at school, or the one who is left standing on a corner when a bus is late or when it has already come and gone.

Consolidated schools have found ways to meet most of these problems. They have learned to give special attention to the difficulties that are bound to arise when active children are confined twice daily in a school bus. Transporting children never becomes wholly routine. City dwellers, accustomed to commuting on bus, train, or subway, need to be made aware of what risks are involved when children ride the school bus or use public transportation facilities without wise adult supervision. Experienced school staffs in cities plan very carefully and provide more than usual supervision when they take a

class of children on a field trip in the city. Children on the way to school need the same kind of planning and supervision.

The problems of providing safe, healthful, and educationally useful bus transportation are not insurmountable. School personnel can make adjustments to minimize the separation between bussed and neighborhood children. The concern of parents of old and new students can be assuaged. However, the problems challenge ingenuity and require a willingness to support added costs.

All too often the experience has been that for reasons not always expressed, some of the bussed children drop out and some of the neighborhood children are withdrawn, either to be entered in a nonpublic school or to move away from the neighborhood. Such movements tend to snowball, and the public school staff is helpless. One group or the other tends to become dominant. The loss of continuity of education for the children moving out or in adds to their problems.

The hopes aroused by proposals for bussing as a way to achieve racial integration in the schools have not yet been fully realized. Bussing has a dramatic impact. Its success depends on the care, foresight, and resources a school district can devote and on the willingness of all who are affected to work together to solve problems as they arise.

Open Enrollment

Open enrollment has been useful, but it, too, has drawbacks. The children of ambitious, secure Negro families who leave their neighborhood school the poorer for their withdrawal are likely to come as strangers to their new school. When they come in large enough numbers for their own comfort, they often find the number of white classmates dwindling or a tendency toward voluntary racial separation that reduces the anticipated integrating effects.

Few school districts have found ways to differentiate and enrich the programs and resources in open-enrollment schools to make them compellingly attractive to and used by both disadvantaged and middle class groups. Summer schools and some comprehensive high schools have come closer to succeeding and are worth careful study to see what accounts for that near-success. Elementary schools, particularly in the primary grades, often find parents of young children less willing to have their children travel daily out of the home neighborhood.

While rarely fulfilling optimistic expectations, open enrollment has had some success when the staff and patrons of the receiving school have been involved in the planning so that orientation and individual help have been given to the prospective enrollees.

Controlled Balance

Controlled balance by assignment of pupils to schools seems to depend for its success on a relatively stable population. Its effects appear to be quite temporary when the racial composition of the school district is changing. It works best when the numbers to be affected are relatively few. Short of some detailed control on the place of residence of every family—a control that is increasingly futile unless it can reach across school district, or even city and state, lines—one can only balance the enrollment as of a given moment. If a district has very few white families or has few or no Negro families, reassignment within that district cannot result in racial balance.

A historical study of the population of districts in and around most metropolitan areas would demonstrate the mobility of successive waves of immigrant groups, first closely huddled, then dispersing somewhat, and finally moving out of the city to be replaced by a succeeding wave. The Negro has not been allowed any comparable mobility. He has had very much less freedom of movement at the same time that nearly all other groups are finding it much easier to move freely within an extended metropolitan area.

Attendance Boundaries

Shifting of boundaries for attendance in a given school has helped in some special situations. However, there are often many disadvantages, real and imaginary, for families who are shifted out of a long relationship with a given school. Travel patterns, informal and formal associations, and sheer custom are all disarranged. A shiny new building, fine special rooms, improved programs and resources, reduction in class size—all such advantages can make the new school more attractive and must be capitalized upon if a move is to be quickly accepted. What of the school left behind? It is less attractive and less desirable to those who attend it. This is a troublesome dilemma except when the new boundaries actually are or appear to be more logical and

natural ones than the old. It is most successful when an old school needs replacing and good new schools are built to provide an obvious reason for new assignments—particularly when the old building faculty is not concentrated in one of the new schools.

Reorganization of Grades

Reorganization of grade groupings is another method of integration that has been tried. In a small school district, assigning all primary children to one school and all middle-graders to another, and so on seems to be very effective, particularly when it is seen to lead to better education and richer resources of staff and equipment. Real integration may be achieved, especially when there is no easily available private school. In large districts the sheer size of sections where people live with others of the same single socioeconomic and racial group in similar housing makes this solution difficult to achieve. Existing school buildings, transportation facilities, and travel patterns complicate this approach. The very real values that seem to accrue in such an arrangement, however, have led to a proposal to bring much larger school populations into an organization called the school village.

School Village

The school village idea was first proposed for a city more than fifteen years ago. It has come to mean different things to different people, but basically it is a proposal to bring together on one site, usually removed from downtown for reasons of cost and availability, all of the schools serving a whole school district or a large section of a big city. Such a village fully turns its back on the neighborhoods from which its students come and to which they return. It most resembles in concept the college campus, although it serves a greatly different age range. Usually it presumes that all or most of its students will be transported to school. Sound cost projections have been difficult to determine because of such intangible factors as the cost of acquiring large acreage of land and the indirect costs of street and transportation improvement. Proper disposition of existing buildings is not simple.

Perhaps an assessment of the school village idea must await the experience of some metropolitan school

district. For a really large city, the costs and other implications stagger the imagination. Yet reasonably accurate projections of cost and some other effects surely are possible with a sophisticated computer, skillfully programed.

Bringing all the children, of a wide range of backgrounds, to a common campus has intriguing possibilities for grouping and regrouping students to help each meet his learning objectives and to give each some common cross-cultural contacts and shared experience. If at the same time the abandoned neighborhood schools were to be converted to become civic centers of health, welfare, or social activities, education and government might be brought much closer together in cooperative service for an involvement of all citizens in solving mutual problems.

If the city or section of the city to be served held about 100,000 inhabitants (and New York City would have to have nearly a hundred such sections), the school-age population might be somewhere between 10,000 and 20,000 children. This would present a major transportation problem, for one thing. More significantly, it is an unprecedented large number of children to go to school at one site. To help each school on the site keep within reasonably human bounds, there might be two large senior high schools, four intermediate schools, eight primary schools, and sixteen nursery-kindergarten preprimary schools. Customary site considerations for outdoor play, buffer, transportation, parking, and other uses would dictate at least 240 acres for such a collection of schools.

The problems of organization, building, and program are by no means insoluble, but they call for a humanist approach that might be extremely difficult to achieve and maintain. Clearly, too, this solution entails not only huge capital investment but very large operating funds if it is to be kept humane.

The necessity of taking children away from their homes and neighborhoods and keeping them away longer are factors to be weighed in such a proposal. Some count it a price worth paying. Others think such far-removed village schools would present still another strain on an already weakened home and family unit, the fundamental social relationship institution on which all others must be built.

At any rate, this is a revolutionary proposal. It may have tremendous potential for good in teaching intercultural understanding and in providing common experiences for children of every variety of background. On

the other hand, it is possible that the close daily proximity of thousands of children, infants to near-adults, may increase the risks and magnify the consequences of conflicts between children that arise even in a small school. Equally such a system has possibilities for dehumanizing, for breaking the ties between generations, and for starting our society down paths we have not explored. In most metropolitan areas it would appear that the center school district might find it very difficult or impossible to bring together a sufficiently representative cross section of children without involving nearby suburban districts.

Catch-Up Programs

Special "catch-up" programs, either in the earliest years to forestall educational handicaps or in middle and later years to remedy deficiencies, have been tried in great variety. Usually their principal purpose has been to raise the educational achievement of children whose cultural background is deficient by middle class standards. Many of those served are Negro children because so many Negroes are in the ranks of the poor. These programs have had considerable success when the resources concentrated on them have been commensurate with their needs. They, along with programs planned under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, those started under the Economic Opportunity Act, and other federally supported programs, have helped upgrade the educational opportunities of Negro children and youth. It is important to note, moreover, that they have demonstrated how much more money cities must have for education if they are to meet the needs of the poverty-ridden, and that anything that adds opportunity for children of the submerged poor cannot fail to help many Negro children to grow in competence, self-respect, and dignity.

These programs, multiplied many times, are very important and may even be prerequisite to the full elimination of color barriers. But they call for the greatest sensitivity to feelings and to appearances lest they still further strengthen the separation and feeling of apartness between Negro and white. They can be most useful when they are part of an all-fronts effort to improve all educational opportunity, to get high-quality education for every individual. And the best such programs set Negro and white children and youth side by side working at common tasks, under skillful supervision

that ensures growth of understanding and mutual respect. However, catch-up programs are not directly aimed at increasing interracial understanding and hence are not reported here in detail.

Bussing, open enrollment, balancing, boundary shifting, grade reorganization, and catch-up programs have all been tried. Many of these approaches have foundered because of the much greater mobility of favored groups. The school village is still untried. It is the Commission's view that any or all of these may be worth undertaking in a given situation. In most instances they seem to have value as a sort of holding operation while more fundamental problems are being tackled. It is clear that no school-planned technique can, by itself, solve the problem of race in the schools of America.

So long as the value patterns and cultures of middle class whites and the economically disadvantaged of whatever color are sharply different or are thought to be so; so long as strangeness, suspicion, and myth set off white from Negro and Negro from white; and so long as the choice of residence is relatively unrestricted for whites but severely limited for Negroes; that long will the basic problem persist.

If these more sweeping techniques and programs do not fully or permanently serve their intended purposes, that does not negate their value. There are many approaches, some seemingly little things, that taken together can move every school district forward in erasing interracial problems and promoting interracial understanding.

Chapter 4

Some Things Every School District Can Do

Every district is faced with the job of defining what equal opportunity really is and how it is achieved. It is already, in all likelihood, determined to maintain and improve the quality of education for all and will have come to see that integrated and integrating education can be quality education. It has long since learned the need for involving its staff and its citizens in change. But school districts are widely different.

Among the thousands of school districts, no two are the same. They are rural, small city, county, suburban, and urban. They are all sizes—the 21 largest enroll 100,000 to more than 1,000,000; 111 others enroll 25,000 to 100,000; nearly 950 districts enroll 6,000 to 25,000; close to 5,000 districts enroll 1,200 to 6,000; over 6,500 districts enroll 300 to 1,200; and about 18,000 districts enroll fewer than 300 each. The "average" district has less than 2,000 students enrolled. About half of these districts, mostly the smaller ones, operate only elementary schools, and more than a thousand districts provide only secondary schooling.

Districts vary in how much they depend on local taxes. In four states, the districts raise more than 80 percent of their costs locally, and in six states, less than 25 percent. State averages, of course, conceal much wider ranges among the districts. Most districts still raise considerably more than half of their revenues through local taxes. This fact alone would tell us that they are in no small degree governed in policy and practice by local willingness to support their programs.

School districts vary tremendously in the social, economic, and cultural character of their populations. The great mobility of the American people in recent years has led them to form larger and larger culture islands, to surround themselves with people with about the same income and interests. Very few school districts now include anything like a cross section of incomes, occupations, religious affiliations, national or racial origins, educational attainments, or cultural characteristics. More and more are changing in their composition, although at varying rates. Few have exercised the kind of community control or planning that would lead to the multicultural community.

The effect of regional characteristics is diminishing, on the average, as larger cities tend to be more like one another and as suburbs fill with newcomers. Yet differences do persist with a special force in attitudes toward public education and integration.

With all the immense range of differences, school districts have a great deal in common, both as institutions and in the interests of their citizens. Every school district has the same reason for being. It was created to operate public schools that will provide all the children of all the people with a kind and amount of education that will enable youth to grow into responsible and responsive citizenship in a representative democracy; to equip them for the time when they will take over in their turn the operations of our society with the skills and will to make our nation an ever-better place for all people to join in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Fewer and fewer of these children will live all their lives in the community where they get their schooling, or even in their native state. None will live in a world very much like this world of the 60's.

Although some may not be aware of the fact, every district has the problem of helping every child in it learn to live in amity, mutual respect, and understanding with people unlike himself. He will grow up to a world where those who have the same color of skin as he does and who share his language or his religion will be a minority of the world's peoples.

It is just because districts have so much in common that this chapter is justified. There are no simple solutions. No single proposal yet put forward seems to fit every district in every state, nor resolve every district's problems completely at any stage. Educators are used to this. They know that progress is a matter of hundreds of

little changes made in every aspect of the schools' operations.

The list of suggestions that follows is by no means exhaustive. It is designed to stimulate school people and school districts to make and remake their own lists, improving, improvising, and testing against their own criteria for progress. The items do suggest the broad scale of policy and practice that is affected by and in turn affects the success of the commitment to progress.

General Policies of Boards of Education

Some boards of education open their written statements of policy with a preamble which they sometimes call the "philosophy." Such general statements might well include the following:

1. It is the policy of this board to provide maximum educational opportunity to every child in the district in accordance with his special needs. The district's educational programs and resources shall be shaped to help overcome any initial handicaps—physical, mental, emotional, or cultural—for any child. The board proposes, not to apply the same amount of resources for each child, but rather to distribute its resources to assure each child of the program most needed and desirable for him.
2. It is the expressed intent of this board that every policy, practice, and procedure shall conform with all applicable requirements of federal and state law.
3. It is the policy of this board that all of its programs, curriculums, and educational opportunities shall be measured against the diverse needs of the children and the common needs of the community, state, and nation.
4. It is the policy of this board that in every respect it shall offer the highest quality of education and that a necessary component of high quality is the building of a sense of individual worth and a respect for the worth of others in all children regardless of their backgrounds or capabilities. Specifically the staff shall be encouraged to seek out and create opportunities for bringing together children from the widest possible range of backgrounds under conditions that will promote their respect for themselves and others.
5. It is the intent of this board that board policies, administrative regulations, and practices shall be

designed to build respect for law and order and an understanding of the necessity of due process and that such policies, regulations, and practices shall of themselves be worthy of such respect.

6. It is the intent of this board to cooperate with all governmental and other community agencies to the end that all working together may improve the educational opportunity for all children and the community climate in which the schools operate.
7. It is the policy of this board to seek out and welcome informed views and the active participation of all those who may be affected by any board policy, both prior to the adoption of that policy and at any time when change appears necessary. It is the intent of this board that every policy of the board of education and every administrative regulation and general practice in the schools shall be periodically reviewed and evaluated to the end that they may be continuously revised to contribute to the goals of the schools and community. The superintendent of schools shall schedule periodic reports and opportunities for board review on a regular basis. All board policies shall be subject to amendment and revision as needed and shall be reviewed and formally adopted each year.

Personnel Policies and Practices

All policies affecting the personnel, that is to say the teachers and others who work in the school system, are critical in their effect on the school's goals. Some policies and practices that are especially important are listed below for consideration:

1. In the recruitment, selection, assignment, and supervision of staff, the chief obligation is to provide the best possible education for all children. To be consistent with this obligation, the staff of a school or of the school district should be more than a reflection of the cultural balances within the community; it should be selected and assigned to serve the many purposes of model serving, door opening, and vivid exemplification of the creative engagement of diverse cultures.
2. Recruitment, promotion, and certification standards similarly are designed to bring the best teachers to children. Without lowering such standards in any way, imaginative personnel policies will permit the employment of people with special qualifications

and special contributions to make to intercultural understanding or to programs designed to increase opportunity.

3. Every district, in its recruitment and practice teacher relationships and in its assignment policies, can find ways to achieve many-cultured staffs. Real attention can be given to attracting members of minority groups and to providing them with special help to promote their growth and competence.
4. People with experience in other cultures may have valuable contributions to make. Developmental programs can be established in cooperation with accredited universities or teachers colleges that will help them meet the accepted standards while still preserving their special understandings.
5. Tests and screening practices can be studied carefully to see that they do not impede the recognition of the ability of an individual to accomplish effectively the job as described. Irrelevant tests and data should be eliminated.
6. Inservice workshops and programs can be consciously designed to build mutual respect and understanding and to equip staff members with techniques that are effective with new intercultural or other-cultural situations and people.
7. Teachers and others who try to become more effective can be supported in innovation and given a feeling of pride in being pioneers and innovators. Many opportunities can be made to reward and recognize inventors of promising practices and those who are especially effective in challenging situations.

Organization of the Schools

Every aspect of the organization of the school district and each of the individual schools can be reexamined to be sure that wherever possible it contributes positively to the realization of these objectives.

1. The school day, school week, and school year can be designed carefully in such a way that remedial and developmental opportunities can be provided without any special stigma or any conflict with cherished customs of home, family, school, or neighborhood. When only the "dumb" or "bad" stay after school, it is very difficult to attract children to after-school programs. Departure from the tradi-

tional schedules to make special programs possible may well call for the employment of added personnel. It is neither just nor wise to stretch the efforts and hours of the existing staff too far beyond the traditional work load.

2. The school calendar can be flexible enough to let young people have actual work experiences while they are still giving their major time to the school program. The need for experiences in the work world and in other service functions of a community is not peculiar to the disadvantaged child. When responsibility is accepted as a regular part of the school's practice, programs can be offered without stigma or prejudice attaching to either children or staff.
3. In a large city it is customary to divide the total school district into subdistricts that include certain elementary and junior and senior high schools for administrative and supervisory purposes. Geographical considerations need not be the major factor in such grouping. Rather it may be helpful to bring together schools from diverse economic and social neighborhoods into each administrative subdistrict.
4. All school facilities play a part in increasing or restricting opportunity. In small districts a regrouping of the grades may make it possible to bring together all of the children in selected grades in the district into one building. It is proposed that insofar as possible the location and nature of prospective facilities should be such as will positively promote intercultural understanding and common experience.
5. Every school has both a formal and an informal internal organization. The scheduling of lunch periods, the conduct of athletic and other activity programs, the scheduling and provision of health services, the establishment of subschools within the school, and the grouping for instruction in each of the subjects and activity fields all can be organized to facilitate meaningful cross-cultural experiences.

School-Community Relations

It is still a fundamental principle that only when a school is serving a child well can good school-community relations be established. The relationships of each school with the part of the community it serves, the relationship of the board of education with the total school district, the creative involvement of citizens, and the

opening to news media of every aspect of school program and policy are important to the way people feel about their schools.

1. A large school district can establish an office or employ a person in the top echelon who is responsible for school-community relations. In a smaller school district a committee or council of staff members with continuity of membership may perform much the same function.
2. High on the list of responsibilities of public relations representative or committee is that of monitoring and acting as the conscience in every policy and practice. This person or council should be charged to see to it that every policy, practice, and plan takes into account the possibilities of contributing to the achievement of cross-cultural understanding.
3. Citizens advisory committees can offer a means for involving citizens and for building informed public opinion. Such committees are most useful when they are charged with a specific task, have a schedule for the completion of that task, and are discharged with thanks when the task is accomplished.
4. District-wide and school-wide programs can be undertaken periodically to improve the skill and interest of every school staff member in understanding and in communicating effectively with the community and subcommunities.
5. The principal of a school must be especially sensitive and capable in community relationships. However, some other person or persons at each school can be designated to keep communications open with groups in its community, to keep the schools and other agencies informed and involved, and to lead in a periodic scrutiny of procedures and practices such as reporting, marking, enrolling, and in the conduct of activities to be sure that they are genuinely respectful of human dignity—neither paternalistic nor couched in unfamiliar or threatening terms.
6. Every school can devise specific and general programs that will capitalize on whatever home concern there may be for a child and his welfare and do so in ways that will seem natural and unforced. They can discover ways to make it normal for parents, guardians, older brothers and sisters, or whoever has even the faintest interest in the child to develop and express that interest in the progress and well-being of the child at school. Teachers can be helped to

take in stride unfamiliar ways of expressing that interest, non-middle class language, and other culturally different expressions and situations. All school people need to learn to use language and to show attitudes that communicate effectively their sincere interest.

7. Schools that provide special programs for special needs can seek out and use persons who are able to interpret these programs and to make the invitation and the atmosphere such as to encourage and dignify participation. With imagination, every program for reducing disadvantage or enriching opportunity can be freed of the appearance of labeling, degradation, or discrimination.
8. Adult education programs that will get older brothers, sisters, guardians, or parents into the schools are valuable. Any fear, dislike, or alienation toward school can be overcome if programs are of real interest and use, are attractive, and give feelings of success and build the self-respect of the participant. The felt interests and needs of those whom the school wants to reach must serve as the motivation for the program, and conscious effort is required to build their appetite for courses and relationships that will make them more effective partners with the schools.

Curriculum and Curriculum Materials

When the schools tried to plan ways to bring immigrant newcomers into full participation, they learned many techniques that are of use today. These can be applied, if altered, to fit the needs of full-fledged American citizens and not newcomers. The materials for such programs, and indeed much of the curriculum material and some of the curriculum itself, reflect an America that no longer exists. New attention is required.

1. In the curriculum special attention can be given to music and the arts as reflections of the past and present prides, yearnings, troubles, and pleasures of cultural groups.
2. Every district can examine its social studies and humanities programs to be sure that attention is given to the special cultural contributions of the many different peoples on the earth. The contributions to the growth and development of our nation are especially important. At this stage the contributions and customs of Negro Americans may well be

stressed, but they can most effectively be stressed as part of a series or part of a whole picture.

3. A balance can be achieved between those activities that build respect for differing cultures and those that make all children feel at home and able to contribute successfully to the developing American culture.
4. Cooperative business programs; apprenticeships; and other school-industry, school-business, or other contacts with the world of work can be rigorously developed in such a way as to minimize the effects of color or background and to maximize the opportunities for employment for those who are by their background most handicapped.
5. From the first preprimer through the most advanced textbook used in high school, all curriculum materials can be examined scrupulously for their relevance to today's world and for their support and promotion of cross-cultural understanding and empathy.
6. Any school district can search out and actually create audiovisual materials and programs that have impact on children and lift their sights.
7. Any school district can carefully review all the present student activities, both those officially sponsored and those somehow connected with school, with a view to encouraging and strengthening those that build intercultural understanding and with a view to discouraging those that have negative and disintegrating effects. This is not inconsistent with the appropriate school attitude of support for each child and youth's own church and culture-group activity.
8. In larger districts that include students of many cultural and ethnic backgrounds, some of the following activities and group experiences have been found to contribute to better understanding:
   a. Involvement of class groups from quite different schools in joint field trips, especially in the establishment of joint planning and follow-up activities.
   b. Provision of intercultural contacts in school camping and outdoor education activities, especially where the degree of success and sense of accomplishment is not peculiar to any one cultural group.
   c. Provision of summer schools, including summer high schools, with such specializations and at such places as will naturally bring together students from every kind of neighborhood.

d. Establishment of all-city or interschool musical organizations and music festivals.

e. Establishment of highly specialized citywide art programs and displays.

f. Provision of common play days held with joint planning by schools and school staffs from different neighborhoods.

g. Planning and conduct of science and technology fairs, particularly if they are designed to attract the interest and participation of people of many different backgrounds.

h. Provision for all-city or interschool student government councils and congresses of student leaders.

i. Establishment of occasional special interest seminars on citywide problems with representation from every school.

j. Establishment of paid and volunteer tutorial programs in which all who are tutored are not always the obviously disadvantaged and those who are doing the tutoring are not always the otherwise advantaged.

k. Promotion of junior service opportunities in which participation and a sense of service are encouraged among all groups.

9. Districts that are racially or socioeconomically homogeneous and are geographically in or close to a metropolitan area can actively seek out involvement in many of the projects that are listed above, crossing school district lines whenever that will contribute to widening the horizons and building common understanding in the district's children.

10. Districts that are single-cultured and segregated because of their remoteness from large cities or their history or homogeneous character can find ways to overcome that handicap to provide a genuine quality education.

    a. They can use many media of communication and devices of transportation to bring to their children constructive contact with representatives of many cultures from outside their community.

    b. They can set up exchange arrangements for individual teachers, short-term or long-term, with districts of quite different composition both within and outside the country.

    c. They can arrange for individual students the same sort of exchange, planning carefully in both

cases to capitalize on the special contributions possible from the teachers or students received in exchange.

d. They can establish visitations by classes with schools in very different cultural settings, giving the most careful preparation to make this a positive developmental project.

e. They can plan with groups from other neighborhoods, communities, or states to meet at some historical point, campsite, or other point of interest.

f. They can build an appreciation of the values to be gotten as well as given in such exchanges.

g. They can study their own district and their own school to discover whether in fact they are building understanding among groups or whether their own schools reinforce barriers within the community.

h. They can teach and learn that cultures differ greatly among and within regions within the nation as they do among religious and ethnic groups—and that all are American.

i. They can use their language programs as bridges to build understanding. Particularly can they teach and learn the relationship between language and culture.

j. They can investigate and capitalize on nationwide and worldwide agencies that have programs designed to build contact and understanding across national and cultural boundaries. The School to School program developed by the State Department in which communities are matched and the work of the Peace Corps and many other agencies of good standing are actively promoting intercultural understanding.

These lists, to repeat, are illustrative and not exhaustive. They suggest that the rural northern Scandinavian school district, the all-Negro or Mexican school district, the Indian reservation and the upper middle class white suburb all have special problems of building genuine appreciation of the contributions of diverse cultures. They suggest that many large city school districts have the same problem for quite different reasons. They suggest that every district with the will to advance the capacity of its children to play meaningful roles in the many-cultured nation and world of tomorrow must be inventive, imaginative, and creative in all aspects of its programs and practices, large and small.

Chapter 5

The Schools Cannot Do It Alone

The public schools are only one of many agencies and institutions in every community that must be involved in the national program to eliminate the problems of race or color. The people have laid a special charge on the schools, one that is testing to the limits the vitality of public education itself and the strength and wisdom of its leaders. The schools are responding. School boards, superintendents, and those who staff the schools can be counted on to do all in their power to meet and solve these pressing problems. But they cannot do it alone.

The commitment to provide an equal and appropriate opportunity for every child and to eliminate color of skin or family background as a determinant of any child's opportunity is more than an educational commitment—it is a public one.

This Commission does not presume to say what all other agencies ought to be or do. However, it is impelled to give the schoolman's view of the conditions and relationships that will support the educational assignment to our schools.

We turn first to our fellow governmental agencies. Each one has its own defined sphere of operations, and each in its sphere has an important contribution to make to the school's and to the public's commitment. For example, police departments work to maintain equal

protection under the law for all citizens, to preserve peace, to prevent lawbreaking, to detect lawbreaking, and to apprehend offenders. In the composition of their forces, in the manner of their acting, and in the even-handedness with which they go about their business they can reflect unmistakably the genuineness of public commitment to equal opportunity and cross-cultural understanding.

The same is true for all other governmental agencies. Public works departments, building inspectors, zoning and planning commissions, welfare departments, health departments, urban renewal and urban planning agencies, library commissions, parks and recreation departments, human rights commissions, youth commissions, the city manager, the mayor and the city council—all these and others, in the schoolman's view, have special obligations and special opportunities both to reflect and to affect the commitment of the community and its government.

The courts, particularly the juvenile courts, have a very important part to play, too. They should be exceptional defenders of human dignity and contributors to genuine equality. We urge that all court and probation offices be adequately staffed so that each offender and each unfortunate family may find in them a compassion that points the way to renewed opportunity for self-respect.

Every district has scores or even hundreds of civic and welfare organizations. We wish that all could be fully infused with the will and the resources to make opportunity real and the community's commitment full-bodied. The service clubs, community chests, councils of social agencies, Junior League, women's clubs, the League of Women Voters, garden clubs, patriotic organizations, relief and welfare agencies, ministerial associations, labor unions, chambers of commerce, churches and synagogues, newspapers, radio and television media, management councils, employment agencies, boards of realtors, associations of property owners and taxpayers, neighborhood associations and block clubs—all such agencies share a heavy component of civic responsibility. Every community has within it not only a different array of agencies, but a different distribution of power over public affairs and public opinion. In all their activities and in the inclusiveness of their membership they, too, can reflect and contribute to the commitment they share with us.

School people are accustomed to the understanding

and active support of the PTA and all the school-related organizations such as teachers associations and student leadership groups, booster clubs, and others. But to get the job done we must look to these organizations to review their own policies, practices, and commitments. They have a most powerful influence on the immediate environment of the children and on the immediate tone of the school.

Groups organized to promote or to resist progress in equal opportunities have special responsibilities. They must recognize the immediate costs of using school children as pawns and the children's schools as arenas for their controversies. The schools can become the focal point of bitterness and strife. Clearly in such atmosphere and at such times, no action or attitude within the school can build mutual respect and cross-cultural understanding among its children.

This Commission speaks to all these agencies and organizations and individuals. We are prompted by long-established facts as to how values are built and character developed. We do not presume to speak for such groups or to try to tell them what they must do. However, when the schools are charged with a task that has such momentous consequences to every community and to all within these communities, we should fail in our duty if we did not call attention to the necessity for some commonality of purpose and some mutuality of support.

It is not enough for these agencies and organizations to be neutral or even to support the school's policies and practices designed to achieve the new commitment. Neither is it enough for local citizens cheerfully to tax themselves and to support state and federal taxing programs that will enlarge the resources to the point where the public schools are really equipped for the task. Both of these are desirable and essential. But the overarching need is the recognition that the school is but one agency in an educating community.

What the school teaches, tries to exemplify, and tries to develop in children is effective only to the degree that it represents the shared ideals of the community itself. In a report designed for schoolmen and school boards, this section is included to remind us of the necessity of and to support us in the effort to elicit the understanding and support of the community and all its agencies.

Chapter 6

The Commission Believes

The Commission believes in quality education for all. It believes that integrated education is consistent with quality education.

The Commission believes that every child of every economic circumstance and every racial, religious, and ethnic background is entitled to and must be provided with the highest quality educational opportunity of a kind appropriate to his needs and abilities and to the present and prospective demands of society upon him.

The Commission believes that the schools must seek to eliminate all barriers that prevent full access to maximum opportunity for Negro children. It believes that the full integration of all citizens and prospective citizens into American life is an objective toward which all citizens must strive.

The Commission believes that the schools must seek ways to ensure the suitability of programs and to motivate the children to take advantage of programs designed for their special needs.

The Commission believes that the public schools must provide enough common experiences for all children of diverse backgrounds to promote mutual understanding and respect and to develop citizens prepared to live constructively in and to contribute to a many-cultured nation and world. The Commission believes

that this provision is required of every school district in America.

The Commission believes that there is great value in the diversity of means and practices among local school districts so long as they are consistent with public policy and effective in moving toward the goal of equality of opportunity and mutuality of respect.

The Commission believes that every superintendent has an inescapable responsibility to provide leadership in developing the policies and practices which will help his district attain quality education providing for individual needs and common experiences.

The Commission believes that every district is charged to provide the resources and teaching that will bring every child to the threshold of his adult vocational and citizenship undertaking as well equipped as possible.

The Commission believes that the degree to which the schools succeed and the extent of their influence in the development of children's attitudes and capacities depend greatly on support and reinforcement by all agencies, organizations, and individuals that affect the atmosphere and the community in which children live and grow.

The Commission believes that equality of opportunity requires a marshaling of the necessary resources to help every child to overcome any handicaps, whether they be cultural, economic, physical, emotional, or mental.

The Commission believes that the schools need additional financial support beyond any that has been publicly proposed in order to carry out their responsibility toward all children.

The Commission believes that the public schools of America can and will rise to today's crucial educational challenge.